

Docket No.: DE 020187

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please replace each of sheets 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Drawings with the attached Replacement Sheets. Annotated drawing sheets are also attached showing the changes.

Docket No.: DE 020187

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1, 5, 7 and 8 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-13 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner objected to Figures 1 and 7 because they failed to show x-axis labels. (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 2). Figures 1 and 7 have been amended to include the proper labels; as such the objection should be withdrawn. The Examiner objected to Figures 2 and 6 because they failed to show the labels for boxes. (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 2). Figures 2 and 6 have been amended to include the proper labels; as such the objection should be withdrawn. The Examiner objected to Figures 1, 2, and 3 because they failed to be designated by a legend such as a – Prior Art –. (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 3). Figures 1, 2, and 3 have been amended to include the proper labels; as such the objection should be withdrawn.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 3.) Specifically, the Examiner asserts that claim 1 recites an ambiguous limitation in that the recitation “characterized by...” does not provide a defined antecedent subject. (See *id.*, p. 4.) Further, the Examiner asserts that claim 5 does not provide sufficient antecedent basis for the recitation “said capacitor, C₁, R₁, L_c, R_c.” (See *id.*) In view of the amendments to claims 1 and 5, which now provide proper antecedent basis for all limitations, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Docket No.: DE 020187

Applicants note that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failure to provide proper antecedent basis for recited limitations is the sole basis provided for the rejection of this claim. The Examiner failed to provide substantive grounds for rejection of claim 5 under either 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). (See 8/27/07 Office Action, pp. 4-10.) Accordingly, regardless of the disposition of the remainder of the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 should be allowed or the Examiner should issue a renewed Non-Final Office Action providing substantive grounds for the rejection of claim 5.

IV. THE 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being fully anticipated by Brkovic U.S. Patent No 5,940,287 (hereinafter "Brkovic"). (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 4).

Claim 1 recites "A method for controlling the transient response of a power converter powering a load (10), said power converter comprising a power switch (T1), a synchronous rectifier (T2) and a capacitor (30; $C_1, C_2, \dots C_N$) coupled between an input and an output of the power converter, said method comprising the step of disabling said synchronous rectifier (T2) in response to a signal indicative of a change of said load (10), wherein said signal is provided based on a current representing said change of load."

Brkovic shows a schematic diagram of a power converter comprised of a power switch, a synchronous rectifier, first and second driver circuits for driving the power switch and synchronous rectifier, an output inductor coupled to the first switch, and an output capacitor coupled to the output of the converter. (See Brkovic, col. 4, ll. 28-37). The schematic diagram also shows a prior art synchronous rectifier controller that is coupled to the output inductor and to the second driver circuit for disabling the synchronous rectifier. (See Brkovic, col. 4, ll. 43-45). Brkovic describes a method for disabling the synchronous rectifier when the synchronous rectifier controller senses a negative synchronous rectifier current, I_{SR} . (See Brkovic, col. 5, ll. 12-15).

Docket No.: DE 020187

Brkovic does not disclose a method for disabling the synchronous rectifier in response to a signal characterized by a current through one of a load and a capacitor representing a change of load. Conversely, Brkovic discloses a method for disabling the synchronous rectifier when the synchronous rectifier controller senses a negative current through the synchronous rectifier. (See Brkovic, col. 5, ll. 12-15).

Brkovic neither teaches nor suggests a “method comprising the step of disabling said synchronous rectifier (T2) in response to a signal indicative of a change of said load (10), wherein said signal is characterized by being provided based on a current representing said change of load.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Brkovic. Because claims 2-4 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 7 recites “Transient response controller to be used in a power converter powering a load (10), said power converter comprising a power switch (T1), a synchronous rectifier (T2) and a capacitor (30; $C_1, C_2 \dots C_N$) coupled between an input and an output thereof, said transient response controller being coupled at least to said synchronous rectifier (T2) to disable said synchronous rectifier in response to a signal indicative of a change of said load (10), characterized in that said transient response controller (40) is coupled to means for providing said signal based on a current through one of said load and said capacitor representing the change of load.” For the same reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable over Brkovic.

Claim 8 recites “A power converter powering a load, comprising a power switch (T1), a synchronous rectifier (T2) and a capacitor (30; $C_1, C_2 \dots C_N$) coupled between an input and an output of the power converter, and a transient response controller (40) coupled to at least said synchronous rectifier T2, said transient response controller (40) disabling said synchronous rectifier in response to a signal indicative of a change of said load (10), by means for providing said signal based on a current through one of said load and said capacitor representing said change of load, said means for providing said signal being coupled to said transient response

Docket No.: DE 020187

controller (40).” For the same reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is patentable over Brkovic. Because claims 9-13 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 8.

V. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brkovic U.S. Patent No 5,940,287 (hereinafter “Brkovic”); and further in view of Zhang U.S. Patent 6,232,755 (hereinafter “Zhang”). (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 7).

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brkovic, and further in view of Zhang. (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 8).

Claim 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brkovic, and further in view of Zhang. (See 08/27/07 Office Action p. 8).

As discussed above, Brkovic fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 7 and 8. Zheng fails to cure these deficiencies. Therefore, it is these claims are allowable.

Docket No.: DE 020187

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Paul Im, Esq.

IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards

P.O. Box 3001

Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001

Phone: (914) 333-9602

Fax: (914) 332-0615

Email: paul.im@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 27, 2007

By: 
Michael Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP

150 Broadway, Suite 702

New York, NY 10038

Phone: 212-619-6000

Fax: 212-619-0276